DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 717 UD 022 070

TITLE	Division of Personnel Intensive Teacher Training Program.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of School Libraries.
PUB DATE	Mar 81
NOTE	47p.; Table on p.31 may be marginally legible due to small size type.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Admission Criteria; *College School Cooperation; *College Students; Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Interschool Communication; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Relevance (Education); *Special Education; *Special Education Teachers; Student Responsibility

ABSTRACT

The Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITT) was established in response to the critical shortage of special education teachers resulting from the Lora Decree (Education for All Handicapped Children's Act: PL 94-142). Students from ten New York City area colleges were selected to participate in a summer inservice training program. The effectiveness of the program was determined according to the following criteria: (1) the program's success in developing competent teachers; (2) the development of a profile of students; (3) the screening procedures and admission criteria used by colleges; and (4) the quality of college level instruction. The primary data sources of the evaluation included a survey of participating college administrators, a randomly selected survey of supervisors and teachers, and a survey mailed to 600 participating teachers as well as anecdotal records of informal interviews with teacher and administrative personnel. Results of the evaluation indicated inadequacies in the screening and training of participating college students as well as a lack of centralized record keeping, monitoring, and ongoing communication with college administrators. Moreover, it was reported that students did not fulfill their commitment to teach in return for free training and credits. The assignment of the least experienced teachers to the most difficult students without sufficient support, materials, or back-up was cited as a major flaw of the program. (JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED212717

DIVISION OF PERSONNEL
INTENSIVE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

Director: Dr. GERALD I. Brooks

PROJECT INDENTIFICATION NUMBER
0301-00-00000

MARCH 1981

Ancillary Services Evaluation Unit
Sharon Walker, Manager
Diane Grodinsky, Evaluation Assistant
Judith Lane, Consultant
Gloria Wolensky, Consultant
James Meier, Consultant

UD022010

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Office of Educational Evaluation
Richard Guttenberg, Administrator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
	PREFACE	i
	EVALUATION ABSTRACT	iiii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	EVALUATION DESIGN	4
III.	ITT: A PROFILE OF THE 1979 PROGRAM	5
IV.	ASSESSMENTS OF SUMMER TRAINING PROGRAMS AND OF ITT TEACHER PERFORMANCE	13
V.	AVAILABILITY OF SUPPORT SYSTEMS	29
VI.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33

PREFACE

The Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITT) required efforts by numerous institutions, agencies, and offices, not all of whom had extensive prior experience in collaborating with each other. In order to place this report in context it will be useful to review the responsibilities of the parties involved in carrying out the program.

A. New York City Board of Education

1. Division of Personnel

The overall role of the Division of Personnel was to get the program started, review student eligibility and follow-up on students after the completion of training to assure that they were licensed or if they failed to meet their program commitments, that they refunded monies the Board had paid on their behalf. Specific responsibilities of the Division included:

-- publicizing the ITT Program,
-- contacting the colleges about participating in the program,
-- checking on student eligibility,
-- informing students about licensing,
-- arranging opportunities for fingerprinting and licensing by the Board of Examiners,
-- following-up on students who did not accept teaching assignments when offered a job, or in other ways failed to fulfill their ITT contractual commitments, and
-- overseeing procedures for making payments to colleges.

The Division of Personnel also provided input in response to requests from institutions or when it seemed advisable to do so on matters such as student admission to colleges, student placements in summer school sites for practicum experience, and the design of summer course content even

though it had no direct responsibilities in these areas.

2. Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners had final responsibility for developing licensing standards within each teaching category, examining teacher candidates, and issuing teaching licenses.

3. Division of Special Education

The Division of Special Education in general terms was responsible for placements and follow-up supervision of the student graduates/teachers.

This included:

-- finding summer school placements for field practicums,
-- overseeing placement of student graduates of the ITT program in actual teaching assignments, and
-- supervising the newly assigned ITT teachers (a responsibility shared with the school principle and the school districts special education supervisor.)

4. The Law Office

The Law Office received the contracts drawn between the Board of Education and each of the colleges.

B. The New York State Education Department (NYSED)

The NYSED reviews and approves all college programs which offers credit in New York State. The N.Y.C. Board of Examiners accepts the judgement of the NYSED in assessing the adequacy of a student's educational program preparation.

C. The Colleges

Each of the colleges was responsible for admission, instruction, assessment and post-summer course follow-up supervision of the ITT students in its program. More specifically, colleges have sole discretion over:

-- determining program admission standards and selecting students to admit from its pool of applicants.

-- hiring faculty and supervising faculty,

-- determining course offerings (within the ITT program area),

-- supervising summer field/practicum placements,

-- grading students and awarding credits, and

-- visiting ITT student graduates assigned to teaching positions in New York City schools.

New York City
Public Schools

110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Frank J. Macchiarola
Chancellor of Schools

Richard Guttanberg
Administrator
Office of Educational Evaluation

Sharon Walker
Manager
Ancillary Services Evaluation Unit
(212) 596-6355

EVALUATION ABSTRACT

PROGRAM: Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITT)

BUDGET # 0 3 0 1 DIVISION # 0 0 PROJECT # 0 0 0 0 0 - 4 0 6

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS: 600 Students who held bachelor's degrees and had 12 credits in education.

NUMBER OF SITES: Eleven.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS: The training program was conducted at Adelphi, Baruch, Brooklyn, City, Hunter, Lehman, L.I.U., Queens, St. Johns, and Wagner Colleges.

MAJOR PROGRAM COMPONENTS: The ITT Program of summer '79 was designed to prepare teachers for special education classes, particularly classes of emotionally disturbed and neurologically impaired children.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE: To assess the effectiveness of the Intensive Teacher Training Program.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS: While the program was generally successful as measured by the number of teachers who remained as teachers, the program reflected in part the extraordinary set of circumstances that special education found itself in during the 1979 summer. The need for better communication procedures, more pertinent course materials, and more careful screening of applicants were the most critical findings.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Intensive Teacher Training Program (hereafter called ITT) of the summer of 1979 was designed to relieve a critical shortage of special education teachers resulting from the Lora Decree. The ITT Program was conceived of as a means of intensively immersing students in theories and techniques of special education so they could secure provisional teaching licenses in one of two special education areas. The idea was to provide students with a background of information and experience through didactic coursework and on-site practical experience during the summer of 1979. Follow-up workshops were to be instituted in the fall. Eleven colleges in the New York City metropolitian area developed ITT programs which, under the terms of the ITT program, were offered to students tuition-free.

Of over 1700 applicants for ITT places in 11 programs at ten participating colleges, 900-plus students were accepted, 802 completed the summer program and, by late October, 1979, some 540 of these students had been placed as special education teachers in New York City schools. In short, this summer training program was of a massive proportion. Organized hastily without sufficient lead time for careful planning and coordination, the program was called for as a stop-gap measure for an emergency situation.

Program History and Evaluation Background

The Intensive Teacher Training Program was first funded by a reimbursable grant program from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This pilot program was discontinued after one year. The concept of the program, however, actually had its roots back in the mid/late 1960's when, to relieve teacher shortages, provisional licenses were issued on the basis of crash teacher training programs and a minimum number of education credits. The program was revived for the 1978-1979 school year for preparation of secondary school teachers of mathematics, science, and English, modeled on a performance-based teacher education program at Brooklyn College. In that preceding effort, candidates with BA or BS degrees in science, mathematics, or English were to take 12 credits in education for a full-time, emergency position instituted by the New York City Board of Education in response to a critical need for teachers. The 1979 ITT program was similar, except that it focused on the preparation of teachers who would receive provisional licenses in the areas of education for the emotionally or physically handicapped. Basic requirements for licensing included:

1. A BA degree and 12 credits in education.
2. A passing grade on the Board of Examiners test.
3. Satisfactory completion of all summer course work.

The structure of this ITT program generally followed the design of the ITT program the prior year. However, the 1978 program design did not take into account complexities or problems particular to special education, including the following:

1. the political implications of P.L. 94-142, and the Lora Decree;

2. the lack of a groundwork for communication between the academic world and the New York City Board of Education;

3. the restructuring of the Special Education Division at the New York City central administrative level;

4. the complexities of providing a crash special education program within the Division of Personnel at the Central Board;

5. the complex nature of the student population to be taught, as different from teaching mainstream pupils a specific subject area;

6. transfer and reassignment of personnel.

In short, this was a difficult transition period for special education because the Board of Education was endeavoring to vastly expand, virtually "over night," educational services to those with special needs throughout the entire school system. While the ITT program was seized upon as one of several stop-gap measures to help the school system through a demanding time, some of the very problems, inherent in the development and implementation of an effort of such a large scale, adversely affected the implementation of this training program. Not surprisingly, this ITT effort received a tremendous amount of criticism, most of it sustainable and documented in this report. Given the circumstances, however, many of these problems could have been expected and should be viewed in the context of the overall situation. This evaluation, therefore, should be reviewed not just as a document of successes and failures but also for clues for future efforts.

II. EVALUATION DESIGN

The overall purpose of this evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of the ITT program. Within this context some elements specifically examined included:

- the program's success in producing competent teachers;
- the development of a profile of students;
- the screening procedures used by colleges for admitting students; and
- the quality of instruction provided by colleges.

This evaluation design, modeled after the evaluation structure employed for the 1978-1979 program, was based on three primary sources of data:

- a survey of administrators connected to the college programs;
- a randomly selected survey of supervisors and teachers; and
- a survey mailed to 600 teacher participants.

In addition, some anecdotal materials were collected through informal meetings with supervisors, teachers, and Board of Education staff that provided insights about the program.

III. ITT: A PROFILE OF THE 1979 PROGRAM

General

Ten colleges in the New York City area participated in the 1979 summer and fall ITT program. A total of over 1700 applicants applied to these colleges, 919 students were accepted, 802 completed the nine credit programs, and, as of October 25, 1979, 540 of them had obtained temporary per diem certification (TPD) and had been placed in special education teaching positions in the New York City School System. These data, as reported by the individual colleges, are detailed in Table 1.

As specified in original program contracts, enrollees were expected to attend follow-up seminars offered in the fall, 1979. Extrapolating based on responses to the mailed survey, it appears that slightly less than half (46%) of the ITT teachers actually attended those seminars; however, it was not universally understood that those sessions were mandatory -- only 39% of the respondents indicated such an understanding.

Completion of additional requirements for a permanent license was to be undertaken by the ITT teacher at his/her own expense.

Recruitment, Screening, and Admissions

Interviews with 13 officials from the colleges indicated that while several approaches were utilized to notify the colleges and universities, all but two of them heard about the program through some formal communication detailed as follows:

TABLE 1: STUDENT DATA

NAME OF COLLEGE	# APPLICANTS APPLIED	# APPLICANTS ACCEPTED	AREA ENROLLED HC = HEALTH CONSERVATION EH = EMOTIONALLY HANDICAPPED		COURSE PROGRAM: C = COMPLETED I = INCOMPLETE W = WITHDREW F = FAILED NE = NOT ELIGIBLE					TPD EXAMINATION		JOB PLACEMENT AS OF Y = YES N = NO TDJ = TURNED DOWN JOB L = LEFT JOB			
										FAILED 1st time	PASSED After retest				
			HC	EH	C	I	W	F	NE			Y	N	TDJ	L
ADELPHI		100	69	31	77		17	6		16	6	70			
BARUCH	300	76	74		*69	3	4			8	3	41			
BROOKLYN: SP. ED.	130	98		98	98					12	6	66			
MATH & SCI	40	34	17 math	17 sci.	32			2		13 sci. 1 math	32	22			
CCNY	160	130*1		89	87			2		19	8	45*1			
HUNTER	90	87	45	30	73		2		12	10	4	58			
LEHMAN	50	28	16	12	21		7			1		20			
LIU	176	102*2	58	44	95		4		2	33	10	60			
MANHATTAN	135	32	15	17	31		1			5	2	19			
QUEENS	200	103	class roste withheld		98					7	5	66			
ST. JOHNS	250	70*3	30	35	64	1				4	1	26*2			
WAGNER	60	59	41	16	57				2	3	1	32			
TOTALS:	1,591 Approx.	919	348 17 Math	372 17 sci.	802	4	34	10	16	118 Sp. Ed	45	640			

*1 - 89 showed up
*2 - 1 not present
*3 - 1 not present.

2 stu. not IT people

2 failed but being processed

*1 (15) on college list but not as hired
*2 (2) names on payroll not on college lis

INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE

INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE

How the Colleges Heard About ITT: (N=13)

1. Inter-university communication (4)
2. Letter of invitation (3)
3. Board of Examiners inquiry of interest (2)
4. Meeting conducted by the Division of Personnel at Board of Education (4)
5. Heard of program through another colleague (2)
6. Participated in ITT 1978 program (1)
7. Other (1)

Students were recruited by each of the individual colleges starting in the spring, in some cases as early as late-April and in others starting in late-May to early June, 1979. According to college officials, the methods they used to recruit the students included:

1. Flyers (10)
2. Board sent people (1)
3. Board's ad in the Times (8)
4. Word of mouth (4)
5. College posting a bulletin (1)

Table 2 details the ITT admission requirements set by each of the participating colleges. In addition, according to questionnaire responses, one college required recommendations, eight held interviews, three required applications, and all required transcripts.

TABLE 2: ITT ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS AT EACH OF THE COLLEGES

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS	ADELPHI	BARUCH	BROOKLYN SPECIAL EDUCATION	BROOKLYN MATH & SCIENCE	CCNY	HUNTER	LEHMAN	LIU	QUEENS	ST. JOHNS	WAGNER
GRADE AVERAGE						2.5		2.75			
PRACTICUM IN FALL	add'l course in Beh. Mod	✓			✓	✓		✓		✓	
CONTINUANCE IN MA PROGRAM AT OWN EXPENSE	optional		✓			optional	✓		optional		optional
12 + CREDITS IN EDUCATION	✓		✓			15 credits		12 + 3 in child/devel		✓	
B.A./s DEGREES	✓		✓			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
COMMITMENT FOR 1979-80 SCHOOL YEAR	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
STUDENTS DOES NOT HOLD A NYC TEACHING LICENSE & HAS NOT TAUGHT IN NYC		✓	✓		✓	✓		✓			✓

All the colleges urged more lead time for screening students. Some were particularly concerned about techniques for determining student preparation in education, writing, and language skills. Other recommendations for changing and/or improving screening procedures are outlined in Table 3.

TABLE 3

COLLEGE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING ITT STUDENT SCREENING

ITT University or College	Recommendations for Improving the Screening Component
ADELPHI	Start procedure earlier. Applicants must have Ed. degree.
BARUCH	Better communication within the Board and with the colleges.
BROOKLYN: SPEC. ED.	More lead time. Maintain same standards as selection for regular program.
MATH & SCIENCE	Plan earlier for publicity, more in-depth interviews. Science candidates tested for lab. experience prior to admittance; if weak, give specific instructions to pupils before BOE exam. Earlier lead time. By Jan.1, should have knowledge of ITT program.
HUNTER	Have personal interviews done at college as joint venture of BOE & College; field supervisors should be in charge of interviewing applicants.
LEHMAN	Recruit for either EH or HC; one type of group. More lead time.
LIU	More lead time to interview. More advertising.
MANHATTAN	Pre-eligiblity exam testing writing skills. Finger print earlier; BOE deal directly with college, not with students; have specific screening guidelines; BOE do clerical work, not college; have students fill out forms at Board.
QUEENS	More lead time. Use qualified interviewers & standards.
ST. JOHNS	More lead time. More BOE information.
WAGNER	NONE

The college officials were asked to rate the capabilities of the trainees prior to the training program. Their ratings were as follows:

1. Exceptional - 8%
2. Above average - 46%
3. Average - 38%
4. Below average - 8%
5. Poor - 0%

Ninety-two percent of the trainees were considered to be average or above in their educational capabilities. Since the criteria for these categorizations were not indicated by the colleges, it is difficult to interpret this perception, especially in view of the colleges' concern with the process of screening, the fact that eight colleges used a cut-off point equivalent to a C+ average, and that the field supervisors had considerable questions about the initial group which appeared in the fall.

Elements of the Summer Programs

According to the college administrators who responded to the questionnaire, the major difference in the summer programs, as compared to the regular college course offerings, was that ITT had more supervision -- 30 hours more than in a regular semester -- and a greater emphasis on practical issues (assertions, it should be noted, that are contradicted by the testimony of students interviewed in the field, as will be discussed later).

According to the college respondents, the summer program instructional staff included full-time and part-time faculty:

- All part-time staff (25%)

- Some part-time (66%)
- Mostly part-time (9%)

Following the summer courses, nine out of the ten colleges claimed to have offered placement assistance, and all offered follow-up courses or supervision visits to students.

Background Information on Entering ITT Students

Questionnaires were sent to 600 students who had participated in the summer ITT program. Of these 600, 189 (or 32%) of them were completed and returned. While bearing in mind that certain self-selection biases may skew the returns, these questionnaire responses nonetheless provide the best data available on the background of the students who participated in the program. Of the 189 respondents:

- 79% were licensed as elementary school teachers
- 63% were in post-ITT graduate education programs
- 39% were teachers prior to ITT
- 33% had at some prior time held a position as a paraprofessional
- 66% held a position as a teacher at the time the questionnaire was received
- 10% were teaching assistants
- 10% were paraprofessional
- 62% of the respondents applied for the program because they were teaching in this area
- 20% had no other job.

- 43% learned of ITT from a BOE announcement, 38% from friends, and 6% from college advertisements.

Summary of Student Reports on Their Own Performance in Summer Training, Job Placement Status, and Subsequent Plans.

The sample of 189 returned questionnaires revealed that:

- 43% of the grades received were within the A range.
- 30% of the grades received were within the B range.
- 95% passed the per diem exam; of these, 90% passed on the first attempt.
- 76% were offered assignments as a result of ITT; 74% accepted a placement; of these, 66% were still teaching.
- 6% refused an assignment and 14% left an ITT assignment.
- 24% felt prepared for the first week of teaching, 46% felt somewhat prepared, and 17% did not feel well prepared.

IV. ASSESSMENTS OF SUMMER TRAINING PROGRAMS AND OF ITT TEACHER PERFORMANCE

This section of the evaluation is based primarily on a survey of 24 randomly selected ITT teachers and their public school supervisors. Separate responses by 13 administrators of the 11 participating colleges to related questions are also included.

Assessment of Summer Programs

College administrators were asked to rate their college's success in teaching essential skills which their summer programs addressed. Their responses are tallied in Table 4.

TABLE 4

College Administrators' Assessment of the Success of Their Program in Imparting Essential Skills

Essential skills taught in Summer? (1 school did not answer)	If yes, how successful was program in imparting essential skills?				
	UNSUCCESSFUL	MODERATELY UNSUCCESSFUL	MODERATELY SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL	EXTREMELY SUCCESSFUL
1. Overview: Know/ understand the exceptional child					
2. Methods: How to diagnose & interpret educational data			2	6	5
3. Read prescriptive resources			1		4
4. Fieldwork experience (included doing IEP's)				1	3
5. Foundation/History; Social psychology of the exceptional child				3	2

The administrators, when asked how well they thought the courses prepared students to teach in a special education setting, responded:

- Very well (3)
- As well as can be expected (5)
- Moderately well (2)
- Less than adequate (2)

All of the college administrator respondents felt they were successful in meeting their own objectives. Such a question, of course, begs a self-serving answer. As will be seen shortly, ITT participants and school officials were considerably less positive in their assessments. Two of the college respondents candidly indicated that they were unable to meet the needs of the field. College administrator's comments indicated a greater range of views than their multiple-choice answers:

- Field work experience was not sufficient preparation for field placements in areas like Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant;
- "good" within the limits of summer program;
- "excellent" as a step in the total preparation of the students to teach special education;
- "not enough" for those without a background in the area; those students with background in special education and those who had been paras were fine;
- less than adequate, but compensated by students' motivation.

The field interviews with teachers revealed considerably more criticism of the summer training program than praise, as indicated in Table 6. Indeed, only 29% of the respondents indicated predominant satisfaction with their summer college training and many of them mingled some criticism in their remarks. It is also noteworthy that at least five of the eight

who responsed positively were teachers with substantial prior experience - at least six years (for one of these respondents prior experience information was missing). Five experienced teachers made comments similar to the following: "for me, it (the training) was useful because of my years of past experience, but I feel sorry for those who are new to teaching." An overall assessment by the 24 teachers of the quality of their summer training is summarized by Table 5.

TABLE 5

ITT Teacher Assessments of Their Nine Credit Summer Training Program

Comments indicated positive assessments of training (adequate):	7
Comments indicated negative assessment of training (inadequate):	8
Comments indicated mixed assessment of training:	6
Comments indicated unclear assessment or opinion was unavailable:	3

The summer programs were mainly criticized by teachers as being too philosophical or theoretical (eight teachers), and with insufficient field work/experiential components (14). Only one teacher expressed the opinion that the "theory was good." Four teachers stated that they felt the training did not give a realistic picture of what to expect; and seven teachers openly stated that they were not prepared for the children they were to teach. Nine teachers noted that the field placement/internship which was supposed to be an integral part of the summer program was "inadequate," "poorly organized," "makeshift," "a farce," "minimal," and that actual field visits didn't occur at all. Only one teacher stated she felt the internship was good.

Despite the very substantial criticism, 14 teachers expressed a predominately positive opinion about the summer courses. Six teachers were highly critical of the courses, and five had mixed feelings. Four teachers specifically commented on the high caliber of their professors and two teachers vehemently criticized the college faculty as incapable, poor, and unprepared.

Implied positive comments, like "the training wasn't long enough," "what we got was good, but not enough of it," and "too much was packed into too short a period," were made by three teachers.

The ITT teachers surveyed attended at least eight different colleges. One college consistently fared poorly -- in the rating of the summer program by the ITT students, in the rating of courses, and in the correlation of the ratings by supervisors of students' performances.

Supervisors' opinions of the training program, through not generally included in the above compilations, tended to be more critical than the teachers. Their comments, however, closely paralled the teachers, and are summarized by a plea for "more techniques, methods, concrete things, and less philosophy and theory."

Another set of common criticisms which explains, in part, some of the program's shortcomings include: "the program was rushed into" (four teachers), "it was disorganized" (six), and "it was poorly administered" (two). One teacher characterized the situation this way: "In every way we got the typical Board of Education runaround: false promises on jobs, they set up new units in schools and provided no supplies, no materials, no books, not even writing paper. I feel there should be a lot better coordination between the Bureau of the Handicapped and the Office of Personnel."

Standards and procedures were extensively criticized. Teachers, and numerous supervisors felt a need for much better screening procedures for ITT candidates: "I was admitted without even an interview," commented one teacher.

According to another teacher:

> Admission requirements for ITT were too low. ITT seems to have taken a lot of paras and many of them have simply been pushed through. Many show no initiative or interest. They have really been trained as assistants rather than leaders.

On the standards of the courses, said one teacher:

> I, as an experienced teacher, ended up tutoring and helping out other students. They passed everybody and just handed out A's and B's to people who didn't deserve them. Standards were exceptionally low; low standards and ill preparation are evident in the classroom performance of the majority of ITT teachers.

And another:

> People I met in those courses, were not well-provided for. They were not taught very basic things (e.g. lesson plans, use of curriculum materials, etc.) Those people were going to walk into classrooms in September and they didn't know how to write plans, organize classrooms, or anything! I felt sorry for those who went into ITT without prior experience.

Finally, five teachers specifically noted that their ITT preparation was not the area in which they taught (e.g. trained in health conservation and assigned to the emotionally handicapped, or training geared to elementary school level and assigned to a high school). Further, there were various comments (4) that the general orientation of the training was to the elementary school level with inadequate, or no attention to the needs

at higher grade levels such as junior or senior high. This inattention appears to characterize the mandatory in-service training workshops, as well. Every high school teacher interviewed (3) commented on what they perceived as a one-sided focus on elementary school special education matters. Table 6 shows the distribution of the assignments of the interviewed teachers.

TABLE 6

ITT Teacher Assignments

Specialities:	Neurologically Impaired/ Emotionally Handicapped	Children With Emotional Handicaps	Health Conservation
	14	2	8
Levels:	Elementary	Intermediate/ Junior High	High School
	15	6	3

Placement of ITT Teachers

Teachers had nothing but criticism for the Board of Education's hiring hall assignment process. Those who were more discrete described it as "disorganized" or "hectic;" others were less generous in their description. At least six teachers managed to avoid the hiring hall process (usually through prior arrangements with a school principal), and most of them considered themselves lucky in this regard.

District special education supervisors were asked about the factors they considered in assigning classes to new ITT teachers. Their responses are tallied in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Basis for ITT Teacher Class Assignments

Little or no consideration aside from need; arbitrary assignments:	11
Hiring hall circumvented; special considerations were taken into account:	6
Information not available:	7

Given the great need for special education teachers and the tight timing of the ITT program, it is perhaps not surprising that the bulk of the teaching assignments were hastily made with little consideration of particular strengths, preferences, or other factors. The remarks, "in this district by and large you take what you can get," characterizes many of the situations. Nevertheless, five supervisors stated that some effort was made to match the teacher with a specific class based on personal strengths and interests. And, as was noted earlier, some of the teachers who circumvented the hiring hall process did so by direct arrangement with a school principal. In at least one such case, the principal had guided the teacher to the ITT program. One other exception:

> At this school, where we are building a new program, we had the advantage of being able to hand-pick our teachers. So gradually we are getting good ones. We now have 13 special education teachers and only three are licensed; the rest are ITT.

Two supervisors remarked on a political/morale problem provoked by the placement of large numbers of ITT trainees. One noted that he "...had to hire ITT's instead of others who had training and were in the schools, and that created a lot of bad morale." Another stated: "A lot of elementary school teachers would like the opportunity to take ITT." The opinions they expressed conveyed resentment, a sense that more deserving teachers, some of whom have been excessed, have been overlooked and denied a valuable opportunity.

Overall Assessment of ITT Teachers' Performance

Table 8 compares the prior experience in teaching of ITT teachers with their overall performance ratings by school district special education supervisors.

The high percentage of ITT teachers rated as "above average" by their supervisors (60%) is not entirely consistent with other findings in the interview sample (see below) in which many supervisors were fairly critical of the ITT program and the teachers.

Since a major criticism of the summer training program was a lack of provision for field experience, it is relevant that at least 14 out of 22 teachers interviewed did not have prior teaching experience. Teachers who had prior experience were rated above average in all but two instances. Teachers with no experience were given lower ratings.

It may also be that the survey itself is skewed, in spite of attempts at randomness. In conducting the survey at the end of the school year, the survey in effect may focus on the better teachers -- the ones

TABLE 8

Supervisor's Evaluation of ITT Teacher's Performance by Prior Experience of ITT Teachers Interviewed

Supervisor's Evaluations	No Prior Teaching Experience (n=4	General Paraprofessional Experience 1-2 yrs (n=2)	3-5 yrs (n=5)	6 + yrs (n=4)	Special Education Paraprofessional Experience, 3 + Years (n=2)	Other Relevant Experience (n=2)	Information Unavailabel (n-5)	Total (n=24)
Above Average		2	3	3	2	2	2	14
Average	1		2	1			1	5
Below Average	3						2	5

who survived (not to mention any conscious or subconscious inclination by supervisors to show off their "better" teachers). It become apparent that many ITT teachers left the system. Through not specifcially questioned on this, three supervisors mentioned that other ITT teachers under them did not make it. Six supervisors noted that the ITT teachers they supervised were a positive exception; others were not so good. One supervisor commented: "I started with three ITT's and lost two of them -- they were off the wall! This one happens to be very good." Several supervisors expressed the view: "when they were good they were average: when they were bad,they were very, very bad." And finally of the teachers interviewed, three noted that they were assigned in mid-year (November to February) implying that their predecessor (who may or may not have been an ITT teacher) left prematurely.

Correlation analysis based on responses to the mail survey of ITT teachers revealed the following additional conclusions:

1. Respondents with paraprofessional backgrounds were no more likely to rate courses as helpful than people with other backgrounds.

2. About one fourth of the respondents rated the courses as not very helpful.

3. If they didn't rate the courses as helpful, they were more likely to feel not at all prepared the first time in a class.

4. Those who rated courses as not helpful were likely to feel unprepared or average in use of materials.

5. Those who rated courses as not helpful were also likely to say that follow-up workshops were not helpful.

Supervision of ITT Teachers

Both the school district special education supervisors and college instructional staff, who had supervised the ITT teachers as students, observed the ITT teachers during the year. All colleges had planned observation/supervision experiences. The minimum number planned was two times a semester; the maximum, four times a semester. Lehman college staff observed students one time in the field, but 11 times in their on-campus lab. The frequency of school district supervsiory observations varied a great deal as shown by Table 9.

TABLE 9

Frequency of Public School Supervisors' Observations of and Conferences with ITT Teachers

	Formal						Informal						
	0	1	2	3	4+	Info. Not Available	0-1	2-3	4-6	Monthly	Weekly	Daily As Needed	In/o. Not Available
Observations	1	4	7	3	1	8	-	3	3	4	9	4	1
Conferences	1	3	3	-	1	16	-	3	1	5	12	2	1

Both groups of supervisors (school district and college) felt more supervisory observations were needed. Five of the college faculty suggested an increase in supervision time to extend throughout the year; two suggested better coordination with school administrators.

School district supervisors' comments, made in the context of the questions on observations and conferences, included the following:

> ITT teachers need day-to-day backup and positive reinforcement. This can't realistically be done if the college faculty comes every six weeks.
>
> In this school there are 21 special education classes, 18 first year teachers and 14 of them are ITT. There are not enough experienced people to turn to.

Ratings of ITT Teachers in Specific Skill Areas

Both school district special education supervisors and college faculty were asked to rate ITT teachers in each of nine specific skill and knowledge areas. The results are tabulated in Tables 10A and 10B. However, while the school district supervisors' assessments referred to a single teacher, and derived from randomly selected field visits, the college faculty assessments referred to all the ITT teachers under their purview.

Judging by the high trend of critical comments, the assessments by both groups of supervisors were inflated; the college groups assessments were the more inflated of the two. The college faculty rated well over half the ITT;s (58%) as above average or better and only 7% as below average. As reviewed by the school district supervisors, 52% of the itemized ratings were above average or better; slightly more than a third (35%)

TABLE 10A

College Faculty Assessments of ITT Teacher Performance (As a Group)

	Very Strong	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Weak
1. Knowlege of subject area	23% (3)	31% (4)	15% (2)	31% (4)	0 (0)
2. Preparation and planning	23% (3)	38% (5)	31% (4)	8% (1)	0 (0)
3. Motivating students	38% (5)	31% (4)	31% (4)	0% (0)	0 (0)
4. Questioning techniques (eliciting participation)	15% (2)	23% (3)	46% (6)	15% (2)	0 (0)
5. Ability to relate material to students' interest and needs	31% (4)	23% (3)	38% (5)	8% (1)	0 (0)
6. Rapport with, and sensitivity to students	54% (7)	23% (3)	23% (3)	0% (0)	0 (0)
7. Awareness of individual differences	46% (6)	23% (3)	23% (3)	0% (0)	0 (0)
8. Maintaining order/discipline in the classroom	31% (4)	15% (2)	54% (7)	0% (0)	0 (0)
9. Use of materials compared to other first year special education teachers	17% (2)	25% (3)	50% (6)	8% (1)	0 (0)
Totals:	36	30	40	8	0
Percent:	32%	26%	35%	7%	0%

TABLE 10B

School District Supervisor Assessments of ITT Teachers (Individually)

	Very Strong	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Weak
1. Knowledge of subject area	2	10	8	1	1
2. Preparation and planning	4	10	8	1	
3. Motivating students	3	8	8	4	
4. Questioning techniques (eliciting participation)		7	12	4	
5. Ability to relate material to students' interests and needs	3	9	6	4	
6. Rapport with, and sensitivity to students	7	7	7	2	
7. Awareness of individual differences	6	7	8	2	
8. Maintaining order/discipline in the classroom	4	8	6	4	1
9. Use of materials compared to other first year special education teachers	3	9	9	2	
Totals:	32	75	72	24	2
Percent:	15.6%	36.6%	35.1%	11.7%	1.0%

were average; and only about one-eighth (13%) are below average or weak. The ITT teachers were rated highest in preparation and planning; rapport with and sensitivity to students, and awareness of individual differences; and, weakest in questioning techniques, and the use of materials. Extrapolating from this information, one might speculate that the ITT teachers draw strength from a willingness to work hard, which in part compensates for their lack of experience (as reflected in less developed skills and techniques). School district supervisors' comments are in consensus about ITT teacher lack of experience, skills, and techniques, but are divided about teacher attitudes. Some supervisors believe the ITT teachers, as a group, are more motivated than average and others feel they are less so. On the negative side, one supervisor remarked:

> They came in less prepared than usual. The attitude of these teachers is poorer than usual. They feel entitled to the job. But it's a demanding job and they are usually less sensitive, knowledgeable, and experienced. They need to impress upon prospective teachers how tough a job it is.

Another supervisor who feels the ITT teachers are less motivated connects it with his belief that these teachers got an "easy route" to a special education assignment. That supervisor feels that this casual pattern is particularly true for those who got some credits free.

The point made earlier ought to be reiterated here: while ITT teachers were generally rated better than average by their supervisors (both as determined by the summary of the items in the Table 10A and 10B, and in the overall assessment of individual teachers which are tabulated in Table 8) some of these school supervisors made comments critical of the incoming ITT teachers. A sampling of these comments follow:

ITT program is a sham. It provided teachers with nothing. Those who made it would have made it anyway because of their exceptional qualities. But it's a sham in that it gives the most difficult child population to the least prepared teachers. I blame a lot on professors who have little or no knowledge of the city system. None of the ITT teachers came in with any idea of what they were getting into. Especially bad for teachers of emotionally handicapped students. (From a supervisor of 40+ ITT teachers.)

I've had many problems with this teacher; she is not doing a good job.

The nine credits in summer were not much preparation for anything -- they were especially inadequate for special education teaching. Significant lacks in ITT training included:

-Any kind of preparation in techniques, methodology and management -- especially for the brain injured child.

-Doing good lesson plans -- to enable teachers to have confidence in the classroom.

-Specific, concrete behavior modification programs and techniques. Theoretical background was all they (ITT's) had and that, too, was weak.

Some comments indicated a mixed overall assessment:

The ITT teacher shows a great deal of initiative, care, and willingness to work with kids and school personnel. However, ITT had nothing to do with these ratings.

This teacher is extraordinary; not indicative of average.

Some, it's a wonder they survived. Others have done extremely well. A lot depends on the school they were placed in.

Training in EH is inadequate and inappropriate. EH teachers don't have an adequate repertory of behavior options. They lack nuts and bolts. They also come with rigid philosophy about kids.

Positive supervisor comments included:

> Overall this year I'm pleased with ITT teachers in this school. The school is also pleased.

> From what I have seen of people who took ITT, I believe it has worked very well. It has made them more comfortable about what they are doing, how to go about it. Has given them motivation, gotten them into the field. Has expanded their awareness which in turn affects their perception as well. ITT has also given more mobility to teachers -- especially important when you are trying to build a program.

V. AVAILABILITY OF SUPPORT SYSTEMS

During the field visits, teachers were asked several questions about support systems. Their answers fell into two categories: one has to do with support services for children; and the other relates to professional staff development supports for the ITT teachers themselves.

Support Systems for Children

ITT teachers' assessments of support systems for their students are summarized in Table 11.

TABLE 11

Teachers' Assessments of Supports Available for Children

Unit/class receives services it is entitled to:	14
Unit/class does not receive services it is entitled to:	5
Information not available:	5
Teacher and supervisor reports correlate:	16
Teacher and supervisor reports do not correlate:	4
Not possible to compare:	4
Teacher feels available supports are adequate:	4
Teacher feels available supports are inadequate:	11
No comment:	9

These data, while not directly connected to ITT training, indicated a general teacher dissatisfaction with the student services which are provided. Typical comments included:

> They (support people) are there but not helpful.
>
> The (specialist) never confers with teachers,so he is of little help and we have no coordination. It's hard to get the support service people involved enough to prevent crises.

Teachers, and supervisors, often noted that the support specialists are generally overwhelmed with a near impossible load. (For example, a guidance counselor comes two days a week and serves 17 classes).

Also distressing was a comment made by over a half dozen teachers and supervisors that "the principal doesn't view him/herself as responsible for the special education unit here." "Inadequate materials, uncooperative school," was a not uncommon theme. Though not always placing the blame on the school principal, nine teachers made special note of the inadequacies in the materials they were provided, or rather not provided.

Finally, nine teachers cited a need for paraprofessional assistance in special education classes. The extra adult is considered invaluable for numerous reasons, not the least of which is the ever present possibility of one child's trauma setting off the rest of the class.

Difficulties Experienced in Working with the Children

Teachers gave a range of responses to the question: "What difficulties have you experienced in working with these children?" Most of the comments do not seem to be directly related to the summer training

program. Nevertheless, one observation noted by six teachers, with important policy implications, (if true), has to do with the inadequacy of screening and placement, "Several children in my class were terribly misplaced."

Support Systems for Teachers

Teachers were asked about the professional support systems available to them. Their responses are tallied in Table 12. According to the responses to the questionnaire, only 46% of the ITT teachers attended follow-up seminars. Only 39% of them indicated an understanding that these workshops were mandatory. Thirteen percent felt they were generally helpful. Basically consistent with the findings during the field survey, 78% of the respondents by mail reported adequate supervision.

TABLE 12

Adequacy of Support Systems for Teachers

Types of support mentioned:	Useful	Not Useful	Mentioned Without Comment
Principal and/or Asst. Principal	8	8	2
Other teachers/unit team	9	-	-
Supervisor of Special Education	10	8	2
CIT (Crisis Intervention Teacher)	6	-	-
Special Education Training Resource Center	8	2	2
Onsite observation by ITT college professor	6	3	-
Others mentioned:			
Teacher trainer			
College faculty			
Curriculum supervisor			
IPT			
Bureau of Child Guidance Specialists			

Summarizing, the most important supports in order of importance appear to be:

1) Other teachers (often, but not always limited to, teachers in the special education unit).

2) The Crisis Intervention Teacher (CIT) for neurologically impaired/emotionally handicapped program*.

3) Special education supervisors.

4) Special Education Training Resource Center (SETRC) (which received more praise than may be apparent from Table 12)**.

5) The on-site classroom visits by ITT faculty.

*This should also be noted: several HC 30 teachers felt CIT's were equally important for their units as well; crises for which assistance or relief is needed often occur.

**The teachers critical of SETRC felt it was irrelevant to their needs at the post-elementary level.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

The ITT program appears to have achieved its fundamental purpose: namely, the relief of a critical shortage of teachers in special education. As was noted, 540 temporary per diem special education teachers were hired in the fall of 1979. According to a survey of ITT participants, conducted by mail, over half of the 189 people, who responded, plan to continue teaching in New York City. Fifty-nine percent expect to continue teaching in the New York public schools for one year, 34% for two years, and 1% for three years. Also, according to the survey, 41% enjoyed teaching this type of class; 57% did not.

According to the 13 college administrators, 80% would want to have this program in their college again; one person would not and one had mixed feelings.

Statistics aside, perhaps the greatest benefit of ITT was its value as a motivator. Several teachers commented in this regard:

> For me it was a terrific motivator. It got me involved and I'm glad. I only wish I had gotten in sooner. I wouldn't have gotten into teaching without it and I had been trying to get into teaching.

> ITT is a good way in that you can learn about something and see if you want it without spending many years preparing.

Many believe that quality of training is irrelevant when all is said and done -- that the personal and other qualities of the teacher are the determining factor. If that is so, then ITT may be a good way of getting

potential teachers into the system for a screening period prior to permanent appointments. This sink or swim approach, through harsh, may provide a good filtering system for identifying new teachers. Clearly the 1979 summer program produced some real stars. However, whether or not the ITT intensive approach is an effective and cost beneficial means of screening future teachers would require further study.

The successes notwithstanding, the program was poorly planned, incoherently coordinated and administered, resulting in much confusion, frustration, and personal anguish. Some of the problems related specifically to special education: the complex needs of the student population; the difficulty (perhaps unrealism) in quickly training teachers to cope with, much less teach, children with special needs; and the additional knowledge, skill, patience, and sensitivity which is required of such teachers. Other problems derived from the massive scale, the crisis circumstances and the haste with which the program was launched. In short, the program bit off more than it could chew. While responsibilities of the Board, the colleges, and the students were reasonably well delineated, they were not always carried out. There appears to have been little or no provision for monitoring and there was inadequate centralized on-going planning, coordination, and trouble shooting. Some of the most serious problems included the following:

Board of Education:

- Lack of overall coordination, monitoring, record keeping, and on-going communication with the colleges,
- disorganized hiring hall process, and

- inadequate follow-up and support to ITT teachers.

Colleges:

- Inadequate screening of students.
- Although courses ranged from excellent to irrelevant, there was overall, medicore course-offerings with inadequate modifications so as to make courses more appropriate for crash program circumstances.
- Unrealistic, and thus inadequate, expectations and provisions for practical field placements. (It is difficult if not impossible, to provide worthwhile field experiences for large numbers of people during summer months.)
- Insufficiently relevant training; not enough practical experience, and inadequate attention to different needs/issues at the junior high and high school levels.

Students:

- Many students did not fulfill their commitment contracts (commitment to teach in return for free training and credits). It's not clear if authorities followed-up and enforced this element of the program.

On the positive side, the SETRC in-service workshops sponsored by the Board of Education and the follow-up observational visits by college faculty were generally felt to be supportive.

Modifications in the program will certainly be in order if ITT is ever repeated, particularity, as a vehicle of special education. With notable exceptions the program has led to substantial frustrations. Those frustations are perhaps best summed up by a statement by a special education supervisor:

> The way the program is set up, it takes teachers with least experience and assigns them to kids who are most difficult; and then it gives no extra support, materials, or backup.

Recommendations

Since there are no current plans to repeat ITT for special education, the recommendations which follow are aimed at any future summer or intensive training effort.

1. Designate a project director, with authority and responsibility for overall coordination. Particularly when programs arise with inadequate lead time or as a result of crisis conditions, a competent, identifiable locus of decision-making, information, referral, record keeping, and coordination is critical.
2. Organize an advisory policy and planning cabinet particularly when the program is instituted with short notice or under emergency circumstances. Such a cabinet, with representatives from each college and pertinent Board of Education bureaus and offices, would meet regularly to give input on plans and policies, trouble shoot, and would serve to improve the coordination of information through the program network.
3. Arrange intensive, high quality practical experiences. If a strong practicum component will clearly not be feasible, don't mislead participants and others connected with the program but instead look for alternate

modes of instruction and/or training. As has been noted several times already, the over-riding recommendations by both teachers and supervisors was:

> There should be a lot more in-service training; more field experience.

A variation on this view, expressed by at least four people, is to have prospective ITT teachers take ITT coursework after they have had supervised classroom experience, i.e., at a time when they are ready to absorb theory, etc.:

> Summer program is well and good for things like law, methodology, etc., but nothing can compare to the first day in the classroom. With that experience one can then appreciate and get something out of college course-work.

4. Develop an in-service, mentor/buddy system during the first semester of teaching service. Consider requiring coursework in theory and methodology following the in-service experience.

5. Issue guidelines and/or hold informational workshops for school district authorities, who will be receiving program participants and providing suggestions on methods and approaches for in-service support.